Clerk of the Superior Court

SEP 0 9 2005

1 O'DONNELL SHAEFFER MORTIMER LLP PIERCE O'DONNELL (State Bar No. 081298) By: K SANDOVAL, Deputy JOHN J. SHAEFFER (State Bar No. 138331) 2 TIMOTHY J. TOOHEY (State Bar No. 140117) NINA D. FROESCHLE (State Bar No. 131897) 3 550 South Hope Street, Suite 2000 4 Los Angeles, CA 90071 Telephone: (213) 532-2000 5 Fax: (213) 532-2020 Attorneys for Plaintiffs ANDREW and ANDREA BERG, individually and dba WAVE 6 LENGTH HAIR PRODUCTIONS, GERALD J. MARCIL; and JOHN CLEMENT 7 **MOLONY** 8 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP ROBERT E. COOPER, SBN 035888 9 RICHARD P. LEVY, SBN 053980 MARK E. WEBER, SBN 120386 10 KAY E. KOCHENDERFER, SBN 125847 JAMES P. FOGELMAN, SBN 161584 11 333 South Grand Avenue Los Angeles, California 90071-3197 12 (213) 229-7000 13 Attorneys for Defendants SEMPRA ENERGY, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY. 14 and SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY 15 [ADDITIONAL COUNSEL FOLLOW SIGNATURE BLOCK] 16 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 17 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 18 19 J.C.C.P. Nos. 4221, 4224, 4226 and 4228 20 Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule 1550(b)) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER 21 REGARDING INITIAL TRIAL NATURAL GAS ANTI-TRUST CASES 22 I. II. III & IV Trial Date: September 12, 2005 Department: 71 23 Coordination Trial Judge: Hon. Ronald S. Prager 24 This Document Relates to the Pipeline Cases Only] 25 26 27

28

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

WHEREAS, at the Status Conference in the above-captioned case on July 27, 2005 ("Status Conference"), the parties, with the Court's assistance, reached preliminary agreement as to several outstanding issues with respect to the size, scope, format, and binding effect of an initial trial ("Initial Trial") in this matter based on representations made in Court regarding the size of potential claims by Plaintiffs.

WHEREAS, since that time, the parties have clarified the scope of Plaintiffs' claims and have reached a new compromise as to the scope of an Initial Trial, which is set forth below.

WHEREAS, in light of the large number of Motions in Limine, and to accommodate the oral arguments for such motions and to allow sufficient time to address the effect of such rulings upon the Initial Trial, the Court also determined that the trial date for the Initial Trial in this matter will be continued from September 2, 2005, until no earlier than September 12, 2005.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties to this Stipulation and Proposed Order, by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby memorialize the following stipulation:

- 1. The Initial Trial will commence no earlier than September 12, 2005.
- 2. The Initial Trial will be limited to:
 - natural gas core ratepayers of Southern California Gas Company during the time period July 1, 2000 to July 31, 2001; and (ii) residential electricity ratepayers of Southern California Edison Company during the time period July 1, 2000 to August 6, 2003 (collectively "Ventura Residential Sub-Class"); and
 - Residents of California who were electricity residential ratepayers of
 Southern California Edison Company during the time period July 1, 2000

28

to August 6, 2003, except Residents of Ventura County ("Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class.")

- 3. The Ventura Residential Sub-Class will be defined as a separate and distinct subclass pursuant to California Rule of Court 1855(b) prior to the commencement of the Initial Trial that comprises members of larger classes already certified. The Court will certify the Ventura Residential Sub-Class in advance of the Initial Trial, without further notice to members of the Ventura Residential Sub-Class (all of whom are already in larger certified classes). The parties will ask the Court, after it has reviewed the entire record, to find and order that (1) the use of the sub-class definition for the Ventura Residential Sub-Class is for case management purposes and does not reflect a material or adverse change in any class members' rights, and does not add or subtract anyone from the case, and (2) the Court has looked at the notice issue and determined that notice is not necessary given the above and given the prior notice in this case. This certification will be without prejudice to Defendants' rights on appeal to challenge the appropriateness of any class certification in the coordinated Natural Gas Antitrust Cases, J.C.C.P., Nos. 4221, 4224, 4226 and 4228. The parties' intent in creating the Ventura Residential Sub-Class is to create a sub-class of plaintiffs whose claims will be finally resolved by the Initial Trial such that following trial and any post-verdict motions a final judgment can be entered as to the Ventura Residential Sub-Class claims and that such judgment would be appealable consistent with section 904.1 of the Code of Civil Procedure.
- 4. The Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class will be defined as a separate and distinct sub-class pursuant to California Rule of Court 1855(b) prior to the commencement of the Initial Trial that comprises members of larger classes already certified. The Court will certify the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class in advance of the Initial Trial, without further notice to

members of the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class (all of whom are already in larger certified classes). The parties will ask the Court, after it has reviewed the entire record, to find and order that (1) the use of the sub-class definition for the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class is for case management purposes and does not reflect a material or adverse change in any class members' rights, and does not add or subtract anyone from the case, and (2) the Court has looked at the notice issue and determined that notice is not necessary given the above and given the prior notice in this case. This certification will be without prejudice to Defendants' rights on appeal to challenge the appropriateness of any class certification in the coordinated Natural Gas Antitrust Cases, J.C.C.P., Nos. 4221, 4224, 4226 and 4228. The parties' intent in creating the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class is to resolve finally the electricity claims of this sub-class, even though the underlying gas claims of the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class will not be litigated or resolved in the Initial Trial. The parties intend and agree, however, that any judgment entered following the jury's verdict in the Initial Trial concerning the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class would be interlocutory, would be stayed, and not subject to execution or to appeal pursuant to section 904.1 of the Code of Civil Procedure until such time as the underlying gas claims of the members of this sub-class are finally resolved. Specifically, members of the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class are also members of other certified classes with respect to their claims of damage suffered in the form of higher natural gas bills. Any judgment following a jury verdict on the Initial Trial would not resolve the amount of such separate natural gas damage claim suffered by the members of the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class, if any. Such claims will be addressed and resolved by the resolution of the claims of other certified classes of which the members of the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class are

28

- also members. Proceedings to resolve such additional claims will not commence until after full exhaustion of all rights to seek and obtain direct appellate review of a final judgment with respect to the Ventura Residential Sub-Class.
- 5. Evidence as to liability, causation and damages for the Ventura Residential Sub-Class and the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class will be presented at the Initial Trial prior to any deliberation by the jury. Jurors will then participate in a single deliberation to attempt to reach a verdict as to liability, causation and damages, if any, with respect to the Ventura Residential Sub-Class, and the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class. With respect to electricity damages, the jury will return a single verdict for the total of the damages for residential electricity customers served by Edison. If the parties can agree prior to the jury commencing deliberation, the jury will then be asked to apply a particular percentage to the total damage amount, if any, awarded to residential electricity customers served by Edison in order to allocate the electricity damage award between the Ventura Residential Sub-Class and the Remaining Edison Customers Sub-Class. If the parties are unable to agree prior to the jury commencing deliberation, the parties agree that the Court will determine the allocation of the total damage amount awarded to residential bundled electricity customers served by Edison as between the Ventura Residential Sub-Class and the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class.
- 6. The Court shall only enter final judgment as to the Ventura Residential Sub-Class, and such judgment shall be subject to immediate appeal by the parties following exhaustion of any post-trial motions. It is the intent of the parties that as a result of the Initial Trial of the Ventura Residential Sub-Class claims, there be a final, appealable judgment entered. The Court shall enter an interlocutory judgment as to the electricity claims of the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class, but such interlocutory judgment shall be stayed and the Court will not enter

a final judgment after the verdict in the Initial Trial as to any other plaintiffs, including but not limited to the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class. A final judgment consistent with CCP 901.4 shall not be entered as to the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class until the underlying natural gas claims of the members of the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class have also been adjudicated in separate, later proceedings, after exhaustion of all rights to seek and obtain direct appellate review from any final judgment from the Initial Trial as to the Ventura Residential Sub-Class.

- 7. Subject to further order of the Court, all proceedings in this action shall be stayed pending exhaustion of all rights to seek and obtain direct appellate review of the final judgment as to the Ventura Residential Sub-Class entered as a result of the Initial Trial.
- 8. After receiving the jury's verdict in the Initial Trial, prior to entry of judgment, the Court will resolve issues regarding Plaintiffs' Unfair Competition Law claims, any offsets or any other basis for challenging or reducing the verdict, and any other matters appropriately raised by the parties necessary to enter a final judgment as to the Ventura Residential Sub-Class claims and an interlocutory judgment as to the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class' electricity claims.
- 9. If the Initial Trial proceeds to a judgment, all parties to this Stipulation and [Proposed] Order (whether or not participating in the Initial Trial) agree to be bound by any judgments, rulings, and determinations in the Initial Trial as to common issues that become final after exhaustion of all appeals, to the extent that Defendants are bound by such judgments, rulings, and determinations pursuant to the doctrines of collateral estoppel and/or res judicata. Defendants agree that they will not challenge in subsequent trials the amount of damages, if any, from the jury's verdict in the Initial Trial as to the Remaining Edison Electricity Customers Sub-Class, but Defendants' agreement only becomes effective after full exhaustion

of all rights to seek and obtain direct appellate review from a final judgment, if any, as to the Ventura Residential Sub-Class claims and only applies if the damages award is upheld on appeal. If for any reason the Initial Trial of the Ventura Residential Sub-Class fails to produce an immediately appealable final judgment pursuant to section 904.1 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the Parties hereto agree and understand that Plaintiffs may not execute on or seek to enforce or collect any judgment in their favor on the Ventura Residential Sub-Class claims until after there is an appealable final judgment pursuant to Section 904.1 of the Code of Civil Procedure and full exhaustion of all rights to seek and obtain direct appellate review of the Ventura Residential Sub-Class Claims.

- 10. The Plaintiffs set forth in the Second Amended Master Complaint, including all individual and class Plaintiffs, who are not among the Plaintiffs included in the Ventura Residential Sub-Class and Remaining Edison Residential Customers are allowed to participate through their counsel in the Initial Trial, as though their clients were actual litigants, by acting in conjunction with counsel for the Ventura Residential Sub-Class and Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class, who are Plaintiffs in the Initial Trial.
- 11. The Plaintiffs agree that the maximum amount of any bond required by the Defendants to perfect any appeal in this action will not exceed \$75 million or any lesser amount determined by the Court.
- 12. Nothing in this Stipulation limiting the Initial Trial to the Ventura Residential Sub-Class and the Remaining Edison Electricity Customers Sub-Class is intended in any way to limit the right of any party hereto to introduce otherwise relevant and admissible evidence at the Initial Trial on common issues with respect to the residential class members of liability, causation and fact of damages that otherwise would be admissible in a trial of the already certified classes, subject to the objection or motion *in limine* of any party and the resolution of any such

objections or motions by the Court. Plaintiffs, however, agree that they will not call as a witness any class member who is not a member of the Ventura Residential Sub-Class or the Remaining Edison Residential Customers Sub-Class to testify in the Initial Trial. The Parties further hereto agree that any specific and unique issues of liability, causation and damages, as distinct from general, common issues relating to liability, causation and damages, if any, with respect to all natural gas and electricity ratepayers in Northern California shall not be part of the Initial Trial and no evidence with respect to specific and unique issues of Northern California liability, causation and damages, if any, will be presented during the course of the Initial Trial. The Parties hereto agree that these specific and unique Northern California issues will be addressed, if necessary, in a future trial. Nothing in this Stipulation is intended to limit in any way the right of any party hereto to object to otherwise inadmissible evidence.

13. The parties will meet and confer as to the issues set forth in their respective Status Conference Statements that are not resolved by this Stipulation.

Dated: September 6, 2005

ENGSTROM, LIPSCOMB & LACK O'DONNELL SHAEFFER MORTIMER LLP GIRARDI & KEESE ASTRELLA & RICE, P.C. BAKER, BURTON & LUNDY, P.C.

Ry

PIERCE O'DONNELL
Attorneys for Plaintiffs, CONTINENTAL
FORGE CO.; ANDREW and ANDREA
BERG, individually and dba WAVE
LENGTH HAIR PRODUCTIONS, and
GERALD J. MARCIL; THE CITY OF
LONG BEACH, UNITED CHURCH
RETIREMENT HOMES, LONG BEACH
BRETHREN MANOR; ROBERT
LAMOND; SIERRAPINE LTD; DOUGLAS
AND VALERIE WELCH; FRANK AND
KATHLEEN STELLA; JOHN CLEMENT
MOLONY; THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
and THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA

1	Dated: September, 2005	LAW OFFICES OF M. BRIAN McMAHON
2		By: M. Brian Mc Mahon
3		By: M. BRIAN McMAHON Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF
4		LONG BEACH, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, UNITED
5		CHURCH RETIREMENT HOMES, LONG BEACH BRETHREN MANOR, and
7		ROBERT LAMOND
8	Dated: September, 2005	MICHAEL J. PONCE
9	Dated. Boptomber_, 2005	DOUGLAS A. STACEY
10		Abrohul THISTO
11		By: MICHAEL J. PONCE
12		Attorneys for Plaintiffs DOUGLAS AND VALERIE WELCH AND FRANK AND KATHLEEN STELLA
13		RAINLEEN STEDDA
15	Dated: September, 2005	BLECHER & COLLINS, P.C.
16		MAXWELL M. BLECHER GARY M. JOYE
17		JAMES ROBERT NOBLIN
18		Ву
19		MAXWELL M. BLECHER Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE COUNTY OF
21		LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO, CITY OF VERNON, CITY OF UPLAND, CITY OF CULVER CITY,
22		CITY OF BURBANK, CITY OF GLENDALE, IMPERIAL IRRIGATION
23		DISTRICT, WORLD OIL CORP., LUNDAY-THAGARD, DEMENNO-
24		KERDOON, AND EDGINGTON OIL
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	Dated: September, 2005	LAW OFFICES OF M. BRIAN McMAHON
2		2 R. 2 200
3		By: M. BRIAN McMAHON
4		Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, THE PEOPLE OF THE
5		STATE OF CALIFORNIA, UNITED CHURCH RETIREMENT HOMES, LONG BEACH BRETHREN MANOR, and
6		ROBERT LAMOND
7		
8	Dated: September, 2005	MICHAEL J. PONCE
9		DOUGLAS A. STACEY
10		D
11		By: MICHAEL J. PONCE
12		Attorneys for Plaintiffs DOUGLAS AND VALERIE WELCH AND FRANK AND
13		KATHLEEN STELLA
14	Dated: September 6, 2005	BLECHER & COLLINS, P.C.
15 16	Dated: September $\underline{\psi}$, 2003	MAXWELL M. BLECHER GARY M. JOYE
17		JAMES ROBERT NOBLIN
18		11/1 M
19		MAXWELL M. BLECHER
20		Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF SAN
21		BERNARDINO, CITY OF VERNON, CITY OF UPLAND, CITY OF CULVER CITY,
22		CITY OF BURBANK, CITY OF GLENDALE, IMPERIAL IRRIGATION
23		DISTRICT, WORLD OIL CORP., LUNDAY-THAGARD, DEMENNO-
24		KERDOON, AND EDGINGTON OIL
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	Dated: September, 2005	LONG BEACH CITY ATTORNEY ROBERT E. SHANNON
2		
3		By:ROBERT E. SHANNON
5		Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
6		CALIFORNIA
7		
8		
9	Dated: September, 2005	LOS ANGELES CITY ATTORNEY ROCKARD DELGADILLO EDWARD J. PEREZ
10		DONALD I. KASS
11		
12		By:ROCKARD DELGADILLO
13		
14		Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
15		
16	DATED: September $\sqrt{2}$, 2005	OLUNN EMANUEL LIROUHART
17 18		QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK
19		RYAN G. BAKER
20		By: CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK
21		Attorneys for Plaintiff THUMS LONG BEACH
22		COMPANY
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

	200	
1	Dated: September, 2005	LONG BEACH CITY ATTORNEY ROBERT E. SHANNON
2		Dave C.
3		By: ROBERT B. SHANNON
4		1,
5		Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
6		CALLE OZGAZ
. 7		
8		
9	Dated: September, 2005	LOS ANGELES CITY ATTORNEY ROCKARD DELGADILLO EDWARD J. PEREZ
10		DONALD I KASS
11		
12		Ву:
13		ROCKARD DELGADILLO
14		Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
15		CALIFORNIA
16	DATED: September, 2005	
17		QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK
18		CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK RYAN G. BAKER
19		
20		By:CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK
21		Attorneys for Plaintiff THUMS LONG BEACH
22		COMPÂNY
23	+	
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
11		

1	Dated: September_, 2005	LONG BEACH CITY ATTORNEY ROBERT E. SHANNON
2		
3		By: ROBERT E. SHANNON
4		Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF LONG
5		BEACH, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
6		
7		
8		LOS ANGELES CITY ATTORNEY
9	Dated: September 8, 2005	ROCKARD DELGADILLO EDWARD J. PEREZ DONALD I. KASS
		DONALD I. RASS
11		- Odward Nerey
		ROCKARD DELGADILLO
13		Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF
15		CALIFORNIA
16	2005	
17	DATED: September, 2005	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART
18		OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK RYAN G. BAKER
19		KIAN G. BASEN
20		By:
		CHRISTOPHER TAYBACK
21		Attorneys for Plaintiff THUMS LONG BEACH COMPANY
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		^

1 2 3	Dated: September 8, 2005 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP ROBERT E. COOPER RICHARD P. LEVY MARK E. WEBER KAY E. KOCHENDERFER JAMES P. FOGELMAN
4	
5	01-50
6	By: Robert E. Cooper
7	
8	Attorneys for Defendants SEMPRA ENERGY, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY and SAN
9	DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
10	
11	
12	
13	
	IT IS SO ORDERED.
14	AMOM Stages
15	Dated: SEP 0 8 2005
16	THE HONORABLE RONALDS PRAGER
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

BLECHER & COLLINS, P.C. MAXWELL M. BLECHER (State Bar No. 026202) 2 GARY M. JOYE (State Bar No. 117440) JAMES ROBERT NOBLIN (State Bar No. 114442) 611 West Sixth Street, 20th Floor 3 Los Angeles, CA 90017-3120 4 Telephone: (213) 622-4222 Fax: (213) 622-1656 5 Attorneys for Plaintiff THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF SAN BERNÁRDINO, CITY OF VERNON, CITY OF UPLAND; CITY OF GLENDALE; CITY 6 OF CULVER CITY; CITY OF BURBANK; LUNDAY-THAGARD COMPANY; DEMMENO-KERDOON; IMPERIAL IRRIGATION DISTRICT; EDGINGTON OIL CO., and WORLD OIL CORP. 8 ENGSTROM, LIPSCOMB & LACK A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION WALTER J. LACK (State Bar No. 057550) 10 PAUL A. TRAINA (State Bar No. 155805) RAHUL RAVIPUDI (State Bar No. 204519) 11 ELIZABETH HERNANDEZ (State Bar No. 204322) SEAN TOPP (State Bar No. 217701) 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, 16th Floor 12 Los Angeles, CA 90067-4107 13 Telephone: (310) 552-3800 Fax: (310) 552-9434 14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs CONTINENTAL FORGE COMPANY; 15 and CITY OF LOS ANGELES 16 **GIRARDI & KEESE** THOMAS V. GIRARDI (State Bar No. 036603) 17 HOWARD B. MILLER (State Bar No. 031392) DAVID N. BIGELOW (State Bar No. 181528) 18 1126 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90017-1904 19 Telephone: (213) 977-0211 Fax: (213) 481-1554 20 BAKER, BURTON & LUNDY, a Professional Corporation BRAD N. BAKER (State Bar No. 065106) ALBRO L. LUNDY III (State Bar No. 123133) 21 22 ANNE McWILLIAMS (State Bar No. 129264) 515 Pier Avenue 23 Hermosa Beach, CA 90254 Telephone: (310) 376-9893 24 Fax: (310) 376-7483 25 Attorneys for Plaintiffs SIERRAPINE, LIMITED 26 ASTRELLA & RICE P.C. LANCE ASTRELLA (State Bar No. 056478) 27 1801 Broadway, Suite 1600 Denver, CO 80202 28 Telephone: (303) 292-9021

Fax: (303) 296-6347

1	MICHAEL J. PONCE, (State Bar No. 120100) ATTORNEY AT LAW
3	9550 Flair Drive, Ste. 407 El Monte CA 91731 Telephone: (714) 373-0440
4	Fax: (626) 575-1669
5	DOUGLAS A. STACEY, ESQ., (State Bar No. 159976) ATTORNEY AT LAW
6	P.O. Box 55 Laguna Beach, CA 92652
7	Telephone: (949) 715-9241 Fax: (208) 475-7798
8	
9	J. TYNAN KELLY P.C. J. TYNAN KELLY (admitted pro hac vice)
10	Nine Greenway Plaza, Suite 3100 Houston, TX 77046
11	Telephone: 713-888-1809 Fax: 713-871-2024
12	Attorneys for Plaintiffs FRANK and KATHLEEN STELLA, and DOUGLAS and VALERIE WELCH
13	LAW OFFICES OF M. BRIAN McMAHON
14	M. BRIAN McMAHON (State Bar No. 083795) 550 South Hope Street, Suite 2000
15	Los Angeles, CA 90071
16	Telephone: (213) 532-2190 Fax: (213) 532-2020
17	Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, UNITED CHURCH RETIREMENT HOMES, LONG BEACH BRETHREN MANOR, and ROBERT LAMOND
18	LONG BEACH CITY ATTORNEY
19	ROBERT E. SHANNON (State Bar No. 043691) 333 West Ocean Boulevard, 11 th Floor
20	Long Beach, CA 90802
21	Telephone: (562) 570-2200 Fax: (562) 436-1579
21	
22	Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF LONG BEACH
23	LOS ANGELES CITY ATTORNEY ROCKARD DELGADILLO (State Bar No. 125465)
24	EDWARD J. PEREZ (State Bar No. 067107) DONALD I. KASS (State Bar No. 103607)
25	200 N. Main Street, 1600 City Hall East
26	Los Angeles, CA 90012 Telephone: (213) 485-4515
	Fax: (213) 847-3014
27	Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
20	

1 2	LLOYD W. PELLMAN, County Counsel JOHN F. KRATTLI, Assistant County Counsel LILLIAN D. SALINGER, Deputy County Counsel LOS ANGELES COUNTY COUNSEL
3	648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration 500 West Temple Street
4	Los Angeles, ĈA 90012-2713 Telephone: (213) 974-7973
5	Fax: (213) 617-7182
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
7	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART OLIVER & HEDGES, LLP
8	Christopher Tayback (Bar No. 145532) Ryan G. Baker (Bar No. 214036)
9	865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017-2543
10	(213) 624-7707 (Telephone) (213) 624-0643 (Facsimile)
11	Attorneys for Plaintiff THUMS Long Beach Company
12	
13	10888915_1 (4).DOC
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	